

From: [McKenna, Jim](#)
To: [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: RE: FW: AETT - LWG Meeting Notes and Scope for EPA review and approval
Date: 08/28/2008 04:58 PM

Chip, just an FYI: although I am no longer co-chair of LWG, I am still a member of the Management Team with Rick and Bob. Bob is now "chair", so I guess you can either address emails to him as chair, and cc me and Rick, or you can address them to me, Bob and Rick as the Mgmt Team. Either way is ok with me. Thanks, Jim.

-----Original Message-----

From: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2008 4:35 PM
To: Bob Wyatt; Rick Applegate
Cc: ANDERSON Jim M; Amanda Shellenberger; Carl Stivers;
Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov; Julie Fox; McKenna, Jim; Keith Pine;
wolffg@plu.edu
Subject: Re: FW: AETT - LWG Meeting Notes and Scope for EPA review and approval

Bob and Rick,

EPA has reviewed the proposed Scope of the Beneficial Use and Initial Market Evaluation Addendum Document and Pre-Feasibility Study Treatment Technologies Table which was submitted via email on July 17, 2008. The proposed which was provided via email on July 17, 2008. EPA finds that the proposed scope of work is generally acceptable with the following comments:

Task 1

EPA suggests that polling should also include suppliers of building/construction materials, and include past/current raw materials prices and expectations for the near future (2-5 years).

The Scope is focussed on the materials provided in the examples: sand, lightweight aggregate, and topsoil. The initial identification of the full range of potential beneficial uses of material is critical, and uses other than construction fill should also be identified. The lack of a standard for acceptance of this material may be a critical limiting factor which may eliminate a number of potential uses.

Task 2

Page 3 lists several limitations for the Feasibility Study Treatment Technologies table, including unknown cleanup levels, sediment volumes, and treatment area locations, which influence the cost of the treatment technologies. The document states that "treatment technologies that do not effectively treat the Portland Harbor iCOPCs or are clearly cost prohibitive will not be retained for further evaluation in the Feasibility Study." Considering the limitations of this technology screening, it may be premature to totally eliminate technologies from the FS before the "limiting factors" are resolved. This initial technology screening should be revisited once cleanup levels, sediment volumes, and treatment area locations are defined.

The LWG should proceed with the market survey and preparation of the draft treatment technologies table. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Chip Humphrey
EPA